

Docket No. A.25-05-009

Exhibit No. Walmart -01 Testimony

Date: April 28, 2026

Sponsor/Witness: Dr. Jaime McGovern

Walmart 01 – Testimony

February 13, 2026 Direct Testimony of Dr. Jaime McGovern

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric
Company for Authority, Among Other Things,
to Increase Rates and Charges for Electric and
Gas Service Effective on January 1, 2027.
(U39M)

Application 25-05-009
(Filed May 15, 2025)

**DIRECT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS OF DR. JAIME L. MCGOVERN
ON BEHALF OF WALMART INC.**

Justina A. Caviglia¹
Parsons Behle & Latimer
50 W. Liberty Street, Suite 750
Reno, Nevada 89501
jcaviglia@parsonsbehle.com

ATTORNEYS FOR WALMART INC.

February 13, 2026

¹ Not licensed in California

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction..... 3

Purpose Of Testimony And Summary Of Recommendations..... 5

Recommendations..... 6

The Proposed NBBA And Associated Risk Shifting..... 7

Conclusion 15

EXHIBITS

Exhibit JLM-1: Witness Qualifications Statement

1 **Introduction**

2 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS, AND OCCUPATION.**

3 A. My name is Jaime L. McGovern, Ph.D. My business address is Always Building
4 814 Respect Dr., Bentonville, AR 72716. I am employed by Walmart Inc.
5 (“Walmart”) as Senior Manager, Utility Partnerships - Regulatory.

6 **Q. ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU TESTIFYING IN THIS DOCKET?**

7 A. I am testifying on behalf of Walmart.

8 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE.**

9 A. I hold a PhD and a Master of Science in economics from the W.P. Carey School of
10 Business at Arizona State University. I also earned a Bachelor of Arts in economics
11 and mathematics from Arizona State University. I served as a utility analyst at the
12 Oregon Public Utility Commission from 2006-2008 and held the role of Assistant
13 Professor of Economics at SUNY Fredonia and SUNY Oneonta, 2005-2006 and 2008-
14 2010, respectively. I was the Senior Energy Economist at the Citizen’s Utility Board
15 of Oregon from 2013-2018, and the Policy Analyst and Energy Economist at The
16 Utility Reform Network of California (“TURN”) from 2023-2024. At the Oregon
17 Legislature, I was the Revenue Economist responsible for energy, natural resources,
18 forestry, property, and telecommunications from 2017-2023. My Witness
19 Qualifications Statement is attached as Exhibit JLM-1.

1 **Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED TESTIMONY BEFORE THE**
2 **CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION (“COMMISSION”) ON**
3 **WALMART’S BEHALF?**

4 A. Yes. I have testified in A.23-05-010.

5 **Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED TESTIMONY BEFORE OTHER**
6 **STATE REGULATORY COMMISSIONS?**

7 A. Yes, I have submitted testimony with the Montana Public Service Commission, the
8 Arizona Corporation Commission, the New Mexico Public Regulation Commission,
9 the Oregon Public Utility Commission, the Utah Public Service Commission, the
10 Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, the Public Utilities Commission
11 of Nevada, and Colorado Public Utilities Commission in the cases listed under
12 “Commission Dockets” in Exhibit JLM-1.

13 **Q. ARE YOU SPONSORING EXHIBITS IN YOUR TESTIMONY?**

14 A. Yes. I am sponsoring the exhibits listed in the Table of Contents.

15 **Q. PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WALMART’S OPERATIONS IN**
16 **CALIFORNIA.**

17 A. As shown on Walmart’s website, Walmart operates 303 retail units and 13 distribution
18 centers and employs over 102,000 associates in California. In fiscal year ending 2025,
19 Walmart purchased \$36.5 billion worth of goods and services from California-based
20 suppliers, supporting over 310,000 supplier jobs.²

² <https://corporate.walmart.com/about/location-facts/united-states/california>

1 **Q. PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WALMART’S OPERATIONS WITHIN THE**
2 **SERVICE TERRITORY FOR PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC (“PG&E” OR**
3 **“COMPANY”).**

4 A. Walmart has 108 stores and related facilities that take electric service from the
5 Company, primarily on the B10 and B19 rate schedules.

6

7 **Purpose of Testimony and Summary of Recommendations**

8 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?**

9 A. The purpose of my testimony is to provide Walmart’s response to issues in PG&E’s
10 Phase I General Rate Case (“GRC”) filing and to provide recommendations to assist
11 the Commission in its thorough and careful consideration of the customer impact of the
12 Company’s proposed rate increase.

13 **Q. IN SETTING THE REVENUE REQUIREMENT FOR THE COMPANY,**
14 **SHOULD THE COMMISSION CONSIDER THE IMPACT OF THE**
15 **PROPOSED RATE INCREASE ON BUSINESS CUSTOMERS?**

16 A. Yes. Electricity is a significant operating cost for retailers such as Walmart. When
17 electric rates increase, the increased cost imposed on retailers can put pressure on
18 consumer prices and on the other expenses required by a business to operate. Walmart
19 recommends the Commission thoroughly and carefully consider the impact on
20 customers in examining the requested revenue requirement, in addition to all other
21 facets of this case and their relationship to related matters, to ensure that any increase
22 in the Company’s rates is the minimum amount necessary to provide safe, adequate,
23 and reliable service, while also providing PG&E the opportunity to recover its

1 reasonable and prudent costs and earn a reasonable return on its investment.

2

3 **Recommendations**

4 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE WALMART'S RECOMMENDATION TO THE**
5 **COMMISSION.**

6 A. Walmart's recommendation to the Commission for this portion of the docket is that the
7 Commission should closely examine the Company's proposed revenue requirement
8 increase, especially, in light of the following:

9 1. The Commission should require the Company to file supplemental
10 testimony with updated versions of PG&E-10, Chapter 14: Calculation of
11 the Revenue Requirement, and the associated workpapers.³

12 2. The Commission should deny the Company's request to establish the New
13 Business Balancing Account ("NBBA") two-way balancing account.

14 3. If the Commission approves the Company's request for a new business
15 balancing account, the reduction in risk should be reflected in the
16 Company's authorized return on equity ("ROE").

17 **Q. DOES THE FACT THAT YOU MAY NOT ADDRESS AN ISSUE OR**
18 **POSITION ADVOCATED BY THE COMPANY INDICATE WALMART'S**
19 **SUPPORT?**

20 A. No. The fact that an issue is not addressed herein, or in related filings, should not be
21 construed as an endorsement of, agreement with, or consent to, any filed position.

³ 2027 Prepared Testimony Exhibit PG&E-10 Results of Operation, Workpapers supporting Chapter 14, Calculation of Revenue Requirement; and Supplemental Testimony Exhibit PG&E -10.

1 **The Proposed NBBA and Associated Risk Shifting**

2 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE PG&E’S PROPOSAL REGARDING THE NBBA AND**
3 **HOW IT RELATES TO THE COMPANY’S REVENUE REQUIREMENT**
4 **FORECASTS.**

5 A. PG&E proposes to establish a new two-way balancing account, the NBBA, specifically
6 to record and track the difference between the capital revenue requirements based on
7 adopted capital expenditures and the capital revenue requirements based on actual
8 capital expenditures for the New Business Capital Program (Major Work Category
9 16).⁴ Under this proposal, any over-collections or under-collections would be processed
10 through the Annual Electric True-up advice letter process or another rate change advice
11 letter authorized by the Commission.

12 **Q. HOW DOES THE COMPANY JUSTIFY THE NEED FOR THIS NEW**
13 **BALANCING ACCOUNT MECHANISM?**

14 A. PG&E argues that what it describes as “New Business”⁵ work is entirely customer-
15 driven, meaning the Company has “no control”⁶ over the volume or complexity of
16 work requested by customers. The Company asserts that the timing and magnitude of
17 potential customer requests during the current era of building and transportation
18 electrification are difficult to predict with accuracy, and historical recorded volumes
19 have shown a nonlinear increase in demand, making forecasting challenging.⁷

⁴ 2027 Prepared Testimony Exhibit PG&E--4 Electric Distribution (“PG&E Ex. 4”), Vol. 2 of 2, Chapter 10, pg.10-49.

⁵ PG&E-4, Ch. 10, pg.10-49, line 12.

⁶ PG&E-4, Ch. 10, pg.10-49, line 12.

⁷ PG&E-4, Ch. 10, pg.10-49, lines 17-21.

1 Furthermore, PG&E cites California state laws requiring prompt energization and the
2 establishment of energization timelines, arguing that a two-way balancing account
3 provides the financial certainty necessary to develop workplans to serve customers
4 promptly, regardless of whether the volume of work exceeds expectations.⁸

5 **Q. IN WHAT WAY DOES THIS PROPOSAL SHIFT THE RISK OF OPERATING**
6 **AN ELECTRIC UTILITY FROM SHAREHOLDERS TO CUSTOMERS?**

7 A. By implementing a two-way balancing account, the Company effectively removes the
8 risk of forecasting errors and cost overruns from its shareholders and places it upon
9 customers. PG&E explicitly states that without this mechanism, the Company bears the
10 risk that it may not be able to fund the work required to provide safe and reliable service
11 if spending obligations exceed authorized levels⁹. With a two-way balancing account,
12 the utility is authorized to recover its actual costs even if they exceed the adopted
13 forecast. This ensures that the utility recovers its costs to serve customers in a timely
14 manner, but it obligates customers to pay for the actual volume of work, which PG&E
15 admits is "outside of PG&E's control" and "difficult to predict".¹⁰

16 **Q. HOW DOES THE COMPANY USE ITS REVENUE REQUIREMENT**
17 **FORECASTS TO FURTHER LEVERAGE THIS ARGUMENT FOR RISK**
18 **SHIFTING?**

19 A. PG&E leverages its revenue forecasts by presenting the Commission with a choice
20 between the two-way balancing account or a significantly higher "alternative"

⁸ PG&E-4, Ch. 10, pg.10-49, lines 23-28.

⁹ PG&E-4, Ch. 10, pg.10-52, lines 26-27 and pg.10-53, lines 1-2.

¹⁰ PG&E-4, Ch. 10, pg.10-49, lines 17-22.

1 forecast.¹¹ The Company states that absent authorization for the proposed two-way
2 NBBA, the 2028–2030 forecast for MWC 16 must be increased to account for Plug-in
3 Electric Vehicle (“PEV”) demand and carryover work¹². This alternative forecast
4 represents the “upper-bound” of funding needed to meet customer demand.¹³ By
5 positioning the alternative forecast as a higher cost scenario to customers, the Company
6 frames the two-way balancing account—and the associated shift of risk to customers—
7 as the option essential to avoid “further constraints on PG&E’s ability to fund and scale
8 new business work”.¹⁴ Alternatively, if the primary forecast and the two-way balancing
9 account are denied, PG&E requests that this higher alternative forecast be adopted¹⁵.

10 **Q. WHY IS THIS BINARY OPTION OF A SIGNIFICANTLY HIGHER**
11 **FORECAST AND TWO-WAY BALANCING ACCOUNT PROBLEMATIC?**

12 A. With this balancing account, customers are responsible for paying in rates for
13 forecasting staff, technology, and infrastructure, while not receiving the full benefit of
14 those costs in rates. In addition, the Commission recently authorized an ROE, which
15 does not incorporate the additional revenue security provided to the Company and
16 shareholders.

17 **Q. SHOULD CUSTOMERS PAY FOR FORECASTING IN RATES IF THE**
18 **COMPANY CANNOT DEMONSTRATE THE BENEFIT?**

19 A. No, they should not.

¹¹ PG&E-4, Ch. 10, pg.10-50, lines 25-28.

¹² PG&E-4, Ch. 10, pg.10-50, lines 25-28.

¹³ PG&E-4 Ch. 10, pg. 10-52, line 1.

¹⁴ PG&E-4, Ch. 10, pg. 10-52, line 27.

¹⁵ ¹⁵ PG&E-4, Ch. 10, pg.10-50, lines 25-28.

1 **Q. PLEASE RESTATE THE REASONS THAT THE COMPANY PROVIDES FOR**
2 **REQUESTING THE NBBA?**

3 A. The Company provides the following reasons:

4 a. New Business work is customer driven.¹⁶

5 b. The timing and magnitude of potential customer requests during the age of
6 building and electrification transportation electrification is difficult to
7 predict with accuracy.¹⁷

8 c. State law requires prompt energizations.¹⁸

9 d. Utilities need adequate funding to cover the cost of service to achieve the
10 energization policies established in the Powering Up Californians Act.¹⁹

11 e. A balancing account will ensure unspent funds are returned to customers,
12 and needed funds are available for PG&E to complete prompt energizations
13 consistent with state law and the Commission's average and maximum
14 energization timelines.²⁰

15 **Q. PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH OF THESE.**

16 Certainly. Walmart believes that the reasons given above are insufficient to justify
17 the approval of the NBBA for the core business of the Company for the reasons I
18 set forth below.

¹⁶ PG&E-4, Ch. 10, pg. 10-49, line 12.

¹⁷ PG&E-4, Ch. 10, pg. 10-49, line 17.

¹⁸ PG&E-4, Ch. 10, pg. 10-49, line 23.

¹⁹ PG&E-4, Ch. 10, pg. 10-50, line 3.

²⁰ PG&E-4, Ch. 10, pg.10-50, line 10.

- 1 a. New Business work has always been customer driven. To the extent that
2 particular classes are experiencing extremely high or volatile levels of
3 growth, the Company should address this individually, and carefully. In
4 particular, concerning the expansion of very large loads driving growth,
5 forecasting accuracy is important. Any resource allocation directed at these
6 loads should be based on enforceable commitments. Basing those forecasts
7 on verifiable, enforceable, signed contracts, in order to avoid stranded costs
8 and inter-class cost shifting, is also a key consumer protection. Requiring
9 the Company to capture verifiable load growth in base rates ensure that
10 customers receive not only the costs of that additional load, but the benefits.
- 11 b. Walmart recognizes that transportation electrification is evolving, and
12 believes that Rule 29²¹, accomplishes this goal. In particular, Walmart
13 recognizes that Pub. Util. Code Section 740.19(c) requires the Company to
14 treat public EV charging station electrification as core business, and Rule
15 29, allows the company to record costs in its AB84IMA if the growth in
16 that area exceeds forecasts. This is an example of how a memorandum
17 account can be used to address a specific area of uncertainty, not the entirety
18 of the core business.
- 19 c. Prompt energization is core business for the utility. Walmart believes that
20 in setting minimum and maximum energization timelines for customers, it
21 provides a guarantee that customers are not just captive ratepayers but can
22 expect a minimum level of service. This is about timelines, and this means

²¹ https://www.pge.com/tariffs/assets/pdf/tariffbook/ELEC_RULES_29.pdf

1 that the utility would need to forecast, plan for energization and allocate
2 accordingly. Prompt energization does not require the Company to do more
3 energization and should not entitle the Company to additional revenue.

4 d. A two-way balancing account in the absence of a general rate case would
5 eclipse customers and the Commission of the ability to discern whether the
6 Company's budget and resources could actually meet the requirements of
7 these individual goals while still allowing the Company the opportunity to
8 earn the authorized ROE.

9 e. Walmart is unconvinced by this argument. Customers are unlikely to see a
10 credit when the Company is supporting its case for a two-way balancing
11 account by discussing increasing growth and forecast uncertainty.

12 **Q. WHAT IS YOUR RECOMMENDATION REGARDING THE COMPANY'S**
13 **REQUEST TO ESTABLISH THE NBBA?**

14 A. I recommend that the Commission deny the Company's request to establish the NBBA
15 as proposed in Exhibit (PG&E-4), Chapter 10. The Company proposes this new two-
16 way balancing account to record and track the difference between adopted and actual
17 capital revenue requirements for the New Business Capital Program (Major Work
18 Category 16), effectively guaranteeing recovery of these costs regardless of the adopted
19 forecast.

20 **Q. WHY DOES WALMART OPPOSE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NBBA**
21 **REGARDING THE ALLOCATION OF RISK?**

22 A. The proposal inappropriately shifts the fundamental risk of doing core utility business
23 from the Company's shareholders to its customers. Connecting new customers is a core

1 function of an electric utility, yet PG&E argues that because this work is "customer
2 driven" and the volume is outside of PG&E's discretion, it should be shielded from the
3 financial variability associated with it.²² By implementing a two-way balancing
4 account, the Company removes the financial discipline required to manage its capital
5 budget and places the entire burden of forecast variances and cost overruns onto
6 customers. This transfer violates the principle that the utility should bear the risk of
7 managing its own operations within the authorized revenue requirement.

8 **Q. THE COMPANY ARGUES THAT FORECASTING NEW BUSINESS**
9 **DEMAND IS DIFFICULT DUE TO "NONLINEAR" GROWTH AND**
10 **ELECTRIFICATION TRENDS.²³ DOES THIS JUSTIFY THE NBBA?**

11 A. No. Customers already pay for the Company's management and forecasting capabilities
12 through Administrative and General ("A&G") expenses. For example, the Company's
13 Enterprise Financial Forecasting team is funded to develop the Company's overall
14 forecast,²⁴ and the Company commits capital funding to information technology ("IT")
15 to reduce risk, address critical business needs and improve decision making, among
16 other things.²⁵ If the Company's forecasting is so inaccurate that it is deemed "difficult
17 to predict with accuracy," customers should not be required to insure the Company
18 against its own management limitations.²⁶ The cost-of-service ratemaking model

²² PG&E-4, Ch.10, pg. 10-49, lines 12-15.

²³ PG&E-4, Ch.10, pg. 10-49, line 20

²⁴ PG&E-9, Ch. 2, pg. 2-18, lines 25-28

²⁵ PG&E-9, Ch. 2, pg. 2-26, lines 3-18

²⁶ PG&E-4, , Ch. 10, pg. 10-49, line 18

1 provides a budget based on a forecast; it does not promise a dollar-for-dollar true-up
2 for every category where the utility finds prediction challenging.

3 **Q. HOW DOES THE RECENT COST OF CAPITAL DECISION RELATE TO**
4 **YOUR RECOMMENDATION?**

5 A. The Commission should reject the NBBA because it ignores the risk-return balance
6 recently established by the Commission.²⁷ In December, the Commission established
7 an authorized ROE for PG&E of 9.98 percent.²⁸ In reaching this decision, the
8 Commission explicitly considered the "financial, business, and regulatory risks" faced
9 by the utility and concluded that the adopted ROE ranges "adequately compensate the
10 utilities for these risks."²⁹ Relative to the facts contemplated in that case, the
11 introduction of risk-reduction via the proposed NBBA would compensate the utility for
12 risks that it is no longer required to absorb.

13 **Q. REGARDING THE COMPANY'S FORECASTING SCENARIOS FOR NEW**
14 **BUSINESS, DOES THE COMPANY PRESENT A BALANCED RANGE OF**
15 **POTENTIAL OUTCOMES?**

16 A. No, it does not. The Company presents its primary forecast, which serves as the starting
17 point for the proposed NBBA and a significantly higher alternative forecast that it
18 requests be adopted if the NBBA is denied.³⁰ The Company does not present a lower
19 forecast scenario for consideration.

²⁷ Decision 25-12-043, issued December 22, 2025, in Consolidated Applications 25-03-010, 25-03-011, 25-03-012, and 25-03-013.

²⁸ Decision 25-12-043, at Section 5.5 pg. 50

²⁹ Decision 25-12-043, at 5.3.11 p. 45

³⁰ PG&E-4, Ch. 10, pg. 10-50, lines 25-28

1 **Q. WHY IS THIS LACK OF A LOWER FORECAST PROBLEMATIC FOR THE**
2 **PROPOSED NBBA?**

3 A. It reveals that the Company’s proposal is skewed. The Company explicitly
4 characterizes its alternative forecast as the upper-bound of funding needed.³¹ Without
5 a corresponding lower bound, there is no symmetrical reference point to inform
6 decision making.

7 **Q. WHAT DOES WALMART RECOMMEND INSTEAD OF THE COMPANY’S**
8 **PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH THE NBBA?**

9 A. Walmart recommends that the Commission instruct the Company to maintain the Rule
10 29 memorandum account and deny the Company’s request for the NBBA without a
11 commensurate reduction in ROE.

12
13 **Conclusion**

14 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE WALMART’S PRIMARY RECOMMENDATIONS TO**
15 **THE COMMISSION.**

16 A. Walmart’s recommends that the Commission should closely examine the Company’s
17 proposed revenue requirement increase, especially in light of the following:

18 1. The Commission should require the Company to file supplemental
19 testimony with updated versions of PG&E-10, Chapter 14: Calculation of
20 the Revenue Requirement, and the associated workpapers.³²

21 2. The Commission should deny the Company’s request to establish the

³¹ PG&E-4, Ch. 10, pg. 10-52, line 1

³² 2027 Prepared Testimony Exhibit PG&E-10 Results of Operation, Workpapers supporting Chapter 14, Calculation of Revenue Requirement; and Supplemental Testimony Exhibit PG&E -10.

1 NBBA two-way balancing account.

2 3. If the Commission approves the Company's request for a new business
3 balancing account, the reduction in risk should be reflected in the
4 Company's authorized ROE.

5 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

6 A. Yes.

EXHIBIT 1

EXHIBIT 1

Jaime Lyndsey McGovern Ph.D.

Senior Manager, Utility Partnerships Regulatory
Walmart Inc
Business Address: 2608 SE J Street, Bentonville, Arkansas 72716
Jaime.McGovern@walmart.com

EXPERIENCE

- **Jun 2024-Present** **Walmart Inc.**
Senior Manager, Utility Partnerships-Regulatory
- **2023 – Jun 2024** **TURN of California**
Energy Economist and Policy Analyst
- **2017 – 2023** **Legislative Revenue Office Oregon**
Revenue Economist
- **April 2013 – July 2017** **Citizens' Utility Board of Oregon**
Sr. Energy Economist and Utility Analyst
- **August 2008 – July 2010** **State University of New York at Oneonta**
Assistant Professor Economics
- **Jul 2006 – Jun 2008** **Oregon Public Utility Commission**
Utility Analyst III
- **Aug 2004 – Aug 2005** **State University of New York at Fredonia**
Visiting Assistant Economics Professor

EDUCATION

- **Ph.D. Economics** **Arizona State University**
- **M.S. Economics** **Arizona State University**
- **B.A. Summa Cum Laude** **Arizona State University**
Economics & Mathematics
Richmond College Study Abroad Florence, Italy
Goldwater Institute Research Intern

BOARD MEMBERSHIP

- 2025 – Present: Member Advisor on Puget Sound Energy's Resource Planning Advisory Group (RPAG)
- 2025 –Present: Member Advisor on Public Service Company of New Mexico's (PNM) Business Customer Advisory Counsel (BCAC)
- 2025 –Present: Member CAM advisory board for Southern California Edison
- 2025 –Present: Member CAM advisory board for San Diego Gas & Electric

PUBLICATIONS & PRESENTATIONS:

- McGovern, Morand & Reffett. Isotone Recursive Methods for Overlapping Generations Models with Stochastic Nonclassical Production, *Economic Theory* 2012
- OPUC Survey Report on the Demand, Usage, Supply and Pricing of Broadband Services in Oregon
- Hadsell, McAvoy & McGovern, 2013. "Promoting Economic Literacy and Self-Awareness Through An Understanding Of Economic Ideology," *New York Economic Review*, New York State Economics Association (NYSEA), vol. 44(1), pages 54-76.
- Legal and Regulatory frameworks for Estate taxes, property taxes, timber taxes and communications taxes.
- McGovern, J, 2016. "Do Pensions Need Saving: Prepaid Pension Assets in Regulatory Settings", Presentation, National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates (NASUCA) 2016 La Quinta, California.
- McGovern, J. 2017 "What are the Long-Term Consequences of Constrained Energy Conservation Investment: Oregon's Public Purpose Charge - A Case Study". Oregon Legislative Revenue Committee.

PROFICIENCIES AND TRAINING:

- IPU Michigan State University: rates and regulatory training, advanced cost allocation, advanced IOU cost accounting and auditing.
- Macroeconomics, Macroeconomic Theory, Econometrics, Industrial Organization, Econometric Theory, Labor Economics, Game Theory, Probability
- Economics for Leaders certification, Quality Matters Teaching certification

TESTIMONY & STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT BEFORE UTILITY COMMISSIONS:

2026:

- Arizona Docket No. 01933A-25-0103: Tucson Electric Power Company For the establishment of just and reasonable rates and charges.

2025:

- Montana Case No. 2024.05.053: Northwestern Energy's application to increase retail electric and natural gas utility service rates and for approval of service schedules, cost allocation, and rate design
- Nevada Docket No. 25-02016: Application of Nevada Power Company d/b/a NV Energy for authority to adjust its annual revenue requirement for general rates charged to all classes of electric customers.
- New Mexico Case No. 24-00089: In the matter of the application of Public Service Company of New Mexico for revision of its retail electric rates pursuant to advice notice no. 625
- California Case No. A.24-03-019: Application of Southern California Edison Company (U338-E) to Establish Marginal Costs, Allocate Revenues, and Design Rates.

2024

- Utah Case No. UT 24.035.04: Rocky Mountain Power's Application for a General Rate Increase.
- Washington Case No. UE 24-0004/05: Application of Puget Sound Energy (PSE) for a General Rate Revision to update its Electric and Gas Revenue Requirements, rates effective 2025 and 2026.

2023

- California Case No. A.23-05-010: Application of Southern California Edison (SCE) for Authority, Among Other Things, to Update its Electric and Gas Revenue Requirement and Base Rates Effective on January 1, 2025.

2022

- California Case No. A.22-05-015: Application of Southern California Gas Company (U 904 G) for Authority, Among Other Things, to Update its Gas Revenue Requirement and Base Rates Effective on January 1, 2024
- California Case No. A.22-09-015: Application of SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY (U 904 G) and SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY (U 902 G) for authority to revise their natural gas rates and implement storage proposals effective January 1, 2024 in this Cost Allocation Proceeding
- California Case No. A.22-05-016: Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U 902 M) for Authority, Among Other Things, to Update its Electric and Gas Revenue Requirement and Base Rates Effective on January 1, 2024.
- California Avoided Cost Calculator (ACC) Proceeding: Order Instituting Rulemaking to Consider Distributed Energy Resource Program Cost-Effectiveness Issues, Data Access and Use, and Equipment Performance Standards

2019

- California Case No. A.19-03-002: In the Matter of the Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U902E) for Approval of its Proposals for Dynamic Pricing and Recovery of Incremental Expenditures Required for Implementation.

2018

- California Case No. A.17-10-007: Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U902M) for Authority, Among Other Things, to Update its Electric and Gas Revenue Requirement and Base Rates Effective on January 1, 2019.

2017

- Oregon Case No. UE 319: In the Matter of PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY, Request for a General Rate Revision-2017.

2016

- Oregon Case No. UE 311: In the Matter of PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY, Schedule 149, Environmental Remediation Costs Recovery Adjustment-2016.

2015

- Oregon Case No. UE 299: In the Matter of PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY, 2014 Annual Power Cost Variance Mechanism-2015.
- Oregon Case No. UE 294: In the Matter of PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY,

Request for a General Rate Revision-2015.

- Oregon Case No. UE 301: In the Matter of IDAHO POWER COMPANY's 2016 Annual Power Cost Update (APCU).
- Oregon Case No. UM 1713: In the Matter of PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON, Investigation into Large Customer Energy Efficiency Limitations-2015.
- Oregon Case No. UM 1722: In the Matter of PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON, Investigation into Recovery of Safety Costs by Natural Gas Utilities -2015
- Oregon Case No. UG 286: In the Matter of PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON, Investigation into Recovery of Safety Costs by Natural Gas Utilities -2015
- Oregon Case No. UM 1720: In the Matter of NORTHWEST NATURAL GAS COMPANY, dba NW NATURAL, Investigation into Long-Term Hedging Policy-2015.
- Oregon Case No. UM 1719: In the Matter of PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON, Investigation to Explore Issues Related to a Renewable Generator's Contribution to Capacity-2015.
- Oregon Case No. UG 285: In the Matter of CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION, Request for a General Rate Revision-2015.
- CCIF 2015 Phoenix the evolving distribution system

2014

- Oregon Case No. UG 284: In the Matter of AVISTA CORPORATION, DBA AVISTA UTILITIES' Request for a General Rate Revision-2014.
- Oregon Case No. UE 288: In the Matter of PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY, Revision of Schedule 122, Renewable Resources Automatic Adjustment Clause-2014.
- Oregon Case No. UE 286: In the Matter of PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY's Net Variable Power Costs (NVPC) and Annual Power Cost Update (APCU)-2014.
- Oregon Case No. UE 283: In the Matter of PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY, Request for a General Rate Revision-2014.

2013

- Oregon Case No. UM 1654: In the Matter of NORTHWEST NATURAL GAS COMPANY, dba NW NATURAL, Investigation of Interstate Storage and Optimization Sharing-2013.
- Oregon Case No. UG 246: In the Matter of AVISTA UTILITIES, Request for a General Rate Revision-2013
- Oregon Case No. UM 1678: In the Matter of ENERGY TRUST OF OREGON, Request for Proposal for Energy Efficiency, Pay for Performance Pilot Incentive Offering-2013.
- Oregon Case No. UE 263: In the Matter of PACIFICORP, dba PACIFIC POWER, Request for a General Rate Revision
- Oregon Case No. UE 264: In the Matter of PACIFIC POWER 2014 Transition Adjustment Mechanism (TAM)

2012

- Oregon Case No. UM 1633: In the Matter of PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON Investigation into Treatment of Pension Costs in Utility Rates-2012.
- Oregon Case No. UM 1622: In the Matter of ENERGY TRUST OF OREGON Request for Approval of Exceptions to Cost Effectiveness-2012.